

Minutes

MRSP Performance Monitoring Task Team

Thursday, April 12, 2001- 9:00-3:30 p.m.
New West Energy

	Topic	Lead	Anticipated Outcome	Att.
1	Welcome	John Wallace	John Wallace acted as chair for Janie Mollon who was unable to attend. Note: John Wallace will be the new chairperson for the Task Team as Janie Mollon will no longer be attending.	
2	Review of Performance Monitoring Document Draft	All	<p>Discussion of newly added items to draft:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • warning letter- the copy that goes to the ESP regarding the MRSP performance within total UDC service territory is under discussion regarding confidentiality and legal issues. Therefore, this item has been removed from the draft. • Day of install/removal section- left in document currently as a placeholder. No revisions made at this time. • ACC Continuing Certification section- this section was added after the last meeting of the task team to incorporate ACC rules into document. <p>*Action- Evelyn Dryer will review this section and edit for next meeting.</p> <p>Other edits made to document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language added to the Performance Monitoring Description section that states that disputed violations would be removed from the PMR if resolved favorably within the 5-day dispute period. • Events/violations changed to violations only based on discussion and definition of these terms. (see under Definitions section) • Language added to matrix for performance measurement to include "% of Total Service Delivery Points with Violations". • Timeline- discussion that timeline represents a collective violation, not an individual violation. An individual violation would take longer to report due to the fact that two PMR's will produce prior to warning letter being sent. Consensus of group at this time did not see that a second timeline was necessary to demonstrate this. 	

3 **Review of Performance
Monitoring Report**

All

There is no report format developed at this time. Due to the fact that these reports will be systematically produced, it may be impossible to standardize appearance of report. However, criteria that needs to be reported on the PMR will be standardized.

Discussion of criteria:

- Each criteria established will have a section on the report showing number (or percentage) of delivery points with violations.
- **Data Remittance-** If a delivery point misses the deadline established, that would count as one strike on the report. Even if the data is sent before the PMR is produced, any time that the data is missed by the deadline it will appear as a violation.
- **Estimation data-** If a delivery point includes 10% or more of estimated intervals, that will count as one strike on the report.
- **Errors/rejects-** In discussion. There are two scenarios presented by group:
 - A) A single delivery point may have one or more errors for the cycle presented but will count as one strike as it still pertains to a single delivery point.
 - B) A single delivery point may have one or more errors for the cycle presented and each error counts as a strike. If there are four errors within the cycle, this will count as four strikes even though it is for one delivery point.

***Action- Kimarie Aycock will produce sample reports based on different scenarios for the next meeting.**

Other concerns:

- **Sliding scale-** two opinions exist for the scale.
 - A) Percentage or number of allowable errors should decrease as more meters are added, as MRSP's should have more experience and be less likely to have errors.
 - B) Percentage weighted based on volume, so allowable errors does increase as volume increases. Currently the set scale is equivalent to:

Equal to or <5%- 1-100 = 5 max. violations for 100

Equal to or <3%- 101-500= 15 max. violations for 500

Equal to or <1%-1001 and over= 10 max. violations for 1000

***Action-group will discuss further after evaluation at next meeting.**

***Action- Kathryn Hathaway will check in California to see what occurrences of MRSP's consistently failing criteria (but staying within set guidelines therefore not being reported) have been happening.**

4	Definitions of terms	All	<p>Determined that further definition of terms was needed for performance monitoring. The following definitions were agreed upon by group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An exception will be produced and a notification sent when: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) Data is not remitted within deadline. B) A service point has greater than 10% of the intervals flagged as estimated. C) There are occurrences of data or EDI errors. • Violation- a service point with one or more exception that will appear on the PMR. <p>Note: The term event has been struck from the document and replaced with exception to remain consistent with billing terminology.</p>
5	Review Drafts of Letters to MRSP and Director of Utilities	All	<p>The letters were reviewed and edited by the group. Letters with revisions will be updated for next meeting.</p>

Adjournment

PARTICIPANT LIST

PARTICIPANTS AT APRIL 12, 2001
MRSP PERFORMANCE MONITORING TASK TEAM

[illegible]